

Report of Staff Allocation Workgroup

The Staff Allocation Workgroup, which consists of Colleen Hellenbrand (Chair), Len Polczynski, Gary LeRoy, Frank Schultz, and Dennis Mack, met on October 30, 2001 and December 4, 2001. The group focused on the following issues:

- A. Determine baseline number of positions in Waste Program, based on changes in the program since the October 2000 Staffing Allocation Report was approved.
- B. Determine the number of positions to be allocated to Central Office and to each region, according to the new baseline number.
- C. Make recommendations on where to place the two new hazardous waste positions received in the budget and recommend whether Central Office should be allowed to fill the Solid Waste Team Leader vacancy.
- D. Develop a method to determine where new positions should be placed, or where position cuts should be made, if the need should arise in the future.

A. Baseline Number of Positions

The workgroup discussed changes that have occurred in the Waste Program since the approval of the October 2000 Staffing Allocation Report. The following changes were noted:

- The October 2000 report included 0.50 FTE for Dave Kollasch in the baseline number. Dave is a federally funded Senior Environmental Employment Program staff, and doesn't actually have a position number. He should not have been included in the baseline number.
- The October 2000 report included the Julie Ivanov vacancy in the baseline number. The position had been approved to fill at the July 2000 WMT meeting, but it was later determined the program couldn't afford to fill it.
- We received 2 new positions in the budget to do hazardous waste inspection and policy work.

So, the new baseline number of positions in the Waste Program would be:

Baseline Positions from October 2000 Report	101.50
Changes:	
Dave Kollasch Position	- 0.50
Julie Ivanov Position	- 1.00
Additional Positions from Budget	+ 2.00
New Baseline Number	102.00

B. Position Allocation

The workgroup discussed whether to continue to use the 30/70 split used in the October 2000 report to determine the allocation of positions between Central Office and the Regions. There were differing opinions on whether this was a fair split, but the group recommends sticking with the 30/70 split. With 102 as the baseline number, that would calculate as follows:

30% of 102 = 30.6 rounded to **31 FTE - Central Office**

70% of 102 = 71.4 rounded to **71 FTE – Regions**

Target Numbers from October 2000 Report	
Region	FTE
SER	18.5
SCR	13
NER	13
WCR	14.5
NOR	11.5
Subtotal	70.5
CO	31
Total	101.5

Proposed New Target Numbers		
Region	FTE	% of Total
SER	18.5	18.14%
SCR	13	12.75%
NER	13	12.75%
WCR	14.5	14.22%
NOR	12	11.76%
Subtotal	71	
CO	31	0.303922
Total	102	

Current FTE Numbers		
Region	FTE	
SER	18.00	
SCR	12.00	
NER	12.00	Assumes Brand vacancy not filled
WCR	14.00	
NOR	11.00	
Subtotal	67.00	
CO	31.00	Assumes Huebner vacancy not filled
Total	98.00	

The group recommends giving the additional 0.50 FTE to NOR. The basis for our recommendation is that, as part of the decision to approve the October 2000 Staff Allocation Report, NOR indicated that they “could not live with this decision (a target of 11.5 FTE) because NOR needed the ability to fill up to 12.0 FTE when positions were available”.

The following table shows the current status of the central office and regions, based on the new baseline number of 102 FTE. The table shows each work unit's percentage of the total FTE in the program, and the percentage of target number of FTE filled. This table could be used as a tool when making decisions on future position placements or deletions. The tool would work as follows:

When a new position is obtained, or additional funding becomes available to fill a position, the work unit furthest below its target on a percentage basis would get to fill first, assuming there weren't any extenuating or unusual circumstances. The same principle would apply when cuts are needed, except that you would look at the work unit furthest over its target on a percentage basis. According to the current situation shown in the table below, NOR would get a new position, because they are the farthest away, percentage-wise, from being 100% at target.

Current Situation:

Following Huebner's retirement and assuming Brand's position already filled. We have 2 new HW positions to place that are already counted in the 102.

	FTE Target	Percent of Total Target *	Filled	Vacant Positions	Percent of Target FTEs Filled
SER	18.5	18.14%	18	0.5	97.30%
SCR	13	12.75%	12	1	92.31%
NER	13	12.75%	13	0	100.00%
WCR	14.5	14.22%	14	0.5	96.55%
NOR	12	11.76%	11	1	91.67%
Cent. Off.	31	30.39%	31	0	100.00%
Total	102.0	100.00%	99.0	3.0	97.06%

* Unless explicitly changed by the WMT, these percentages remain constant with time, no matter what the baseline number of FTEs in the statewide Waste Program.

C. Placement of New HW Positions and Solid Waste Team Leader Vacancy

The workgroup makes the following recommendations regarding the new hazardous waste positions received in the budget and the Solid Waste Team Leader vacancy:

1. Place the new hazardous waste investigator position in Northern Region. This recommendation is based on the table above which shows NOR currently being the furthest below their target on a percentage basis. Once NOR fills this position, they will be at their target number.
2. Allow the Central Office to fill the Solid Waste Team Leader vacancy and also place the hazardous waste policy position received in the budget in the Central Office. This would put the Central Office two FTE over-target. However, this would be considered a temporary situation. The Central Office would be obligated to give their next two vacancies to the Regions, in order to get back down to their target number. The only exception would be if the vacancies

included a manager or a team leader. These would need to be given special consideration, and could be allowed to be filled if the WMT approved the request.

3. During the time that Central Office is over-target, the Central Office should explore all opportunities to assist any of the Regions that are currently under target.
4. The first vacancy that becomes available in the Central Office would go to SCR. That is based on the numbers in the table above. This would put SCR at their target number.
5. When the second Central Office vacancy becomes available, there will likely need to be a discussion on where to place it. This is because the remaining two regions who will still be under target (WCR and SER), will both be under target by 0.5 FTE. There will need to be a decision on whether to split the vacancy between the two regions, or let one of the regions fill it as a whole FTE.

D. Method for Dealing with Changes to Target Numbers

The workgroup is proposing the following system to be used in the future for determining which work unit will be allowed to fill a vacancy, or which work unit will be required to lose a position.

1. The first step will always be to use the information in the “Percent of Total Target FTEs Filled” table shown above. If a decision can’t be made using the table, then we go to the next step.
2. The second step involves the use of a small workgroup. This workgroup would consist of three members of the WMT, and could include a standing team leader. The original make-up of the group would be two Regional representatives and one Central Office representative. However, after one year, one member of the workgroup would be replaced, and the new make-up of the group would be one regional representative, and two Central Office representatives. The following year, the group would go back to two Regional representatives and one Central Office representative, and this system of rotation would continue on an annual basis. A group leader would be assigned each year.
3. The workgroup would be used in special situations, such as if there were a tie between work units in the percentage of total target FTEs filled, or a new position became available with special conditions associated with it.
4. The process of using the workgroup would be as follows:
 - a. The work units involved in the current situation (either by requesting to fill a vacancy, or requesting not to be required to delete a position) would submit a written request to the leader of the workgroup. The request would need to be submitted in a specific format. (See Attachment A). The

work unit involved would have the option of also presenting their case verbally to the workgroup.

- b. When the workgroup receives a request, they are obligated to meet as a group to make the decision. In other words, they do not have the option of each reviewing the request separately and getting back to the other members of the group.
- c. If the workgroup makes a unanimous decision, there is no option for appealing the decision. However, if the workgroup makes a decision on a 2/3 vote, the work unit(s) negatively impacted by the decision may appeal to the WMT.
- d. When an appeal is requested, the workgroup will provide the original written requests to the WMT. The appeal should be addressed by the WMT as soon as possible. If no regular meeting or conference call is scheduled for the near future, a special meeting or conference call should be held just to discuss the appeal. The work unit(s) requesting the appeal will present their case to the WMT at the meeting or call. The WMT will then vote on the request. The decision will be made based on a simple majority vote of those present. If a member of the WMT cannot be present at the meeting, they cannot send a substitute. The vote will be based on those attending the meeting only. Each region is only allowed one vote.

Attachment A

APPEAL REQUEST

- A. What is the working title and purpose of the position?
- B. Is the position associated with high priority work (e.g., earning grants, new legislation)?
- C. Describe the workload implications of not filling the position – quantify if possible.
- D. Does this position perform unique duties that no one else can back-fill?
- E. Are there any extenuating circumstances related to this position that we should be aware of?